

REMARKS

Claims 1-69 were originally filed with the present application. In a response dated April 27, 2006, claims 40-69 were cancelled and claim 70 was added. Therefore, claims 1-39 are currently pending.

An Office action dated 27 March 2006 identified five groups of inventions in the claims and required election of a single group for prosecution. The invention of Group I, claims 1-9 was elected. An Office Communication dated June 6, 2006 states that Groups I, II and II will be examined, and that Applicants were required to elect a species with respect to charge-transfer promoting material and a species with respect to electronic device and an ultimate species for the charge-transfer promoting material. For the species of charge-transfer promoting material, Applicants elected $\{A-R^{3n-}M^{n+}\}$. For the species of electronic device, Applicants elected EL devices. For the ultimate species for the charge-transfer promoting material, Applicants elected potassium triethoxysilylnaphthalene ("KNTES").

The Office action dated September 25, 2006 states that claims 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 17-20, 28, 29, 36, 38, and 39 are withdrawn from further consideration, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Objections to the Specification

The name and formula for KNTES have corrected in paragraphs 0026, 0038 – 0039, 0041 – 0042 and 0052. It is believed that the objection is hereby overcome.

Rejections Under 37 CFR §112

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 10-16, 21-27, 30-35 and 70 are rejected under 37 CFR §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

The Office action states that it is not clear if the formulae set forth in the Markush group of the independent claims represent the complete formulae for the charge transfer-promoting material. Claims 10, 21, and 30 are now amended to recite a "charge transfer-promoting material comprising a radical anion material having at least a formula selected from the group consisting of AM , $AM^{n+}X_n^-$, and $\{A-R^{3n-}M^{n+}\}$." Claim 70 is canceled. Applicants submit that this language clarifies that the formulae set forth in the claims are complete. However, Applicants

further submit that even if the formulae were not complete, that the limits of what is claimed are clear and not indefinite.

Claim 7 is now amended to depend from claim 1, and to recite “2-(triethoxysilylethyl)naphthalene.” The Office action suggests that it is not clear if the potassium triethoxysilylnaphthalene of claims 7 and 16 requires a salt of a mixture of the isomers of the triethoxysilylethyl naphthalene shown on page 8 of the specification. Applicants submit that it would be clear to one of ordinary skill in the art that the claim language including the name “2-triethoxysilylethyl naphthalene” encompasses one or both isomers: 2-(1-triethoxysilylethyl)naphthalene and 2-(2-triethoxysilylethyl)naphthalene. It is believed that the rejection is hereby overcome.

Rejections Under 37 CFR §102

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 37 CFR §102(b) as being anticipated by US 4,033,852, to Horowitz. Claims 1-9 are now canceled.

Claim 70 is rejected under 37 CFR §102(b) as being anticipated by US 4,132,837 or US 5,874,039. Claim 70 is now canceled.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 10-15, 21-26, 30-34, 37 and 70 are rejected under 37 CFR §102(b) as being anticipated by US 4,769,292, to Tang. Claims 1, 3, 4, 10-15, 21-27, 30-35, 37 and 70 are rejected under 37 CFR §102(b) as being anticipated by WO 02-43447. The rejections are traversed.

As noted in the Office action, Tang discloses organic EL devices containing chelates of oxine, including lithium oxine (lithium 8-hydroxyquinoline). Likewise, WO 02-43447 discloses organic EL devices containing lithium quinolate.

Claims 10, 21, 30 and 70 are now amended to limit the charge transfer-promoting material to fused ring hydrocarbon radical anions, excluding heterocyclic materials such as lithium 8-hydroxyquinoline. It is believed that the rejection is hereby overcome.

Rejections Under 37 CFR §103

Claims 27 and 35 are rejected under 37 CFR §103(a) as being obvious over US 4,769,292, to Tang, in view of US 6,023,371, to Onitsuka.

As noted above, the Tang reference does not teach radical anionic charge transfer-promoting materials; the Onisuka patent does not supply this deficiency. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 27 and 35 are not obvious over the combination. It is believed that the rejection is hereby overcome.

Miscellaneous

Miscellaneous grammatical and spelling errors in claims 10, 21, 24, 25, 30, 32 and 33 set forth in the have been corrected.

In view of the above Amendments and Remarks, Applicants respectfully request allowance of all claims pending herein.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mary Louise Gioeni/
Mary Louise Gioeni
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No.: 41,779

Dated: December 22, 2006

General Electric Company
GE Global Research
1 Research Circle
Niskayuna, NY 12309
Phone (518) 387-6648
Fax (518) 387-7751